

**FAUQUIER COUNTY
ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD**

Meeting Minutes

January 4, 2017

4:00 p.m.

Warren Green Building, 1st Floor Meeting Room
10 Hotel Street, Warrenton

Attendance:

Mary Root, Chair (Citizen-at-Large)
Virginia Gerrish (Center District Representative)
Reta Rodgers (Cedar Run District Representative)
Bob Lee (Planning Commission Representative)
Bryan Jacobs (Lee District Representative)
Jack LaMonica (Marshall District Representative)

Absent:

John Toler (Scott District Representative)

Staff:

Wendy Wheatcraft, Preservation Planner
Maureen Williamson, Staff

1. Ms. Root called the meeting to order at 4:00 p.m.
2. The December 7, 2016 meeting minutes were reviewed. Ms. Root made a motion to approve the minutes, as corrected. Mr. Jacobs seconded the motion. The motion carried 6 – 0.
3. Ongoing Business
 - Revision of Fauquier County Historic Resources Plan

Discussing the draft Table of Contents, Ms. Wheatcraft said that at the last meeting Mr. LaMonica asked about the distinctions between Sections 3 and 4. She clarified that Section 4 would outline specific County preservation policies, while Section 3 would reiterate the goals and actions within Chapter 2, Section B of the Comprehensive Plan, as well as any additionally proposed actions that may assist in attaining the preservation goals. Ms. Root noted that Section 4 was renamed from “Precise Agenda for Implementation” to “Policies.” Also at the last meeting, Ms. Wheatcraft stated that a bullet point under Section 4 of the draft outline was added for a demolition policy. Ms. Root said that it is not likely that a demolition policy would be used that often, but a County policy should be recorded. Mr. Lee said that much of the demolition in the County is demolition by neglect.

Prompted by Ms. Rodgers’ comments and concerns about relocation of historic structures and the repurposing of materials in the case of a demolition, Ms. Wheatcraft said that adding a demolition policy to the Plan revision gives the County a justification to add this element into the demo permit application review process. Mr. Lee suggested that the Community Development Building Permit Division could notify Ms. Wheatcraft when a demolition permit is requested. He also suggested that an automatic delay or hold could be placed on the permit so that Ms. Wheatcraft could review the application to determine the historic nature of the property. Mr. Jacobs agreed by saying that this would give the

County time to assess the options for possible adoption of the structure and/or the conservation of materials.

Mr. LaMonica asked about the demolition permit application fee. Mr. Lee and Ms. Wheatcraft said that the fee is minimal compared to other types of applications, and the permit is easily obtained. Mr. LaMonica suggested that the fee could be waived if the developer/owner requesting the permit be agreeable to options such as advertising the building for sale, moving the building or repurposing the materials. Ms. Wheatcraft said that the County may be reluctant to give up the fee. Mr. Jacobs said that a series of check mark boxes could be added to the permit request form, such as asking if historic buildings have been identified on the property through survey, is the property listed in the National Register, and the age of the structure (i.e. is the structure fifty years or older). Ms. Wheatcraft said that on the application, there could be a question asking the applicant if he/she would agree to work with the County by allowing staff to document the structure before demolition. She said currently, a demolition permit is issued on the same day of application, suggesting that this would be a change to existing review policy. Mr. Lee suggested that Ms. Wheatcraft obtain a copy of the demolition permit application and bring it to a future meeting of the ARB for the group to review it and determine if reasonable enhancements to the form could be proposed.

Mr. LaMonica mentioned the creation of a demolition policy pamphlet to give to those applying for a demolition permit. He said the contents of the pamphlet could include information on the assistance of the preservation planner to assess the building to determine its historic value or if the building materials could be repurposed. Ms. Gerrish noted that the brochure should convey the message that the County places a high emphasis on historic preservation and to be mindful of historic value when making a demolition request. Mr. LaMonica said that the pamphlet could also stress the fact that historic assessment does not mean that a demolition permit will not be granted, if the structure is deemed historic.

Ms. Wheatcraft asked the ARB about the key preservation issues that they see as important to discuss in the revised Plan. She polled the ARB asking if they were in agreement to move forward with Section 3 of the draft, which would highlight key issues and may include additional actions that would alleviate the issues. The ARB said it may be better to only reference the key issues stated in Chapter 2, Section B of the Comprehensive Plan and not expand upon them. The ARB felt it more important to focus on writing strong policies including those for plan development review, demolition, and design guidelines.

Ms. Root volunteered to write Appendix 2 that would include a general description of the historic character of each village historic district listed in the National Register. Ms. Wheatcraft mentioned that it might be a good idea to consider describing other historic villages or crossroad communities not currently listed in the National Register, considering that the Villages chapter of the Comprehensive Plan is in the process of being revised and some of the historic communities named in this chapter may be eliminated from the Comprehensive Plan text.

Ms. Wheatcraft mentioned that the ARB may also wish to consider recommending a change to current zoning law for adaptive use of historic buildings, as currently, an adaptive use is only permitted on a parcel located in an area designated as "Village" in the Comprehensive Plan or located along a major collector. Mr. Lee said that the ARB may wish to recommend making this Zoning Ordinance section more expansive. He continued by saying that there are a number of structures, particularly old country stores,

that are located on parcels now designated with a Village use, but may not comply with the Zoning Ordinance adaptive use standard in the future.

Ms. Gerrish asked for clarification as to which document the ARB is revising. Ms. Wheatcraft stated that the *Historic Resources Preservation Plan* was being revised and explained that Chapter 2/Section B of the Comprehensive Plan (the historic preservation section) was previously revised and adopted by the BOS in 2016. The *Historic Resources Preservation Plan* was then adopted as Appendix I to Chapter 2/Section B. Since the Plan was completed in 2001, some of the text has become obsolete. The Plan revision will propose policies and processes that will expand upon the actions proposed in the historic preservation section of the Comprehensive Plan.

Ms. Wheatcraft noted that the initiation of the *Historic Resources Preservation Plan* revision is scheduled on the BOS consent agenda for the January 2017 meeting. With considerable hours being put into the revision of the Plan, Community Development staff felt it important that the revision be brought to the BOS's attention. Ms. Wheatcraft said that the final draft of the revised Plan would be brought before the BOS for review and official adoption. It was unclear if the revision would need to be presented as a public hearing.

Mr. Lee pointed out that the ARB should outline specific preservation goals and objectives as priorities. Ms. Wheatcraft asked the ARB if the word "priorities" should be added to the Section 3 heading, thereby renaming the section to Goals & Priorities. Mr. Lee made the suggestion to leave it as for now.

The ARB discussed a County policy to be added to Section 3 that would give more direction on how all County departments could incorporate historic preservation consideration into their existing processes/activities. Mr. Lee suggested asking Agricultural Development Department Director, Ray Pickering, to attend a future meeting. Mr. Lee suggested that the ARB should also ask Director of the Parks & Recreation Department, Larry Miller, to recognize historic resources particularly when his department acquires properties for development of recreational facilities.

4. New Business

- May 2017 Public Preservation Workshop Ideas

Mr. Lee presented a May workshop idea for the ARB's consideration to bring in professionals who could discuss the National Register of Historic Places program to assist residents who are interested in nominating a historic property. Ms. Wheatcraft asked the ARB for their thoughts on broadening this workshop topic to include a session regarding the Historic Rehabilitation Tax Credits programs. The ARB mentioned that a tax credits workshop had been presented several years ago in Marshall.

Mr. LaMonica noted that the ARB had previously discussed the idea of a workshop regarding historic agricultural buildings and a historic barn tour with an emphasis on century farms.

Ms. Wheatcraft asked the ARB to keep thinking of workshop topics, dates, etc. so that this agenda item could be discussed more thoroughly at the next ARB meeting.

5. Announcements

Mr. LaMonica announced that the John Marshall Soil & Water Conservation District Office has presented an online survey to update the strategic plan and they are

seeking input from the community. Ms. Wheatcraft stated that she would ask Andrew Hopewell to send the survey link.

- January 10, 2017 – Upperville Survey Grant Project Community Meeting
- The Afro-American Historical Association is hosting a 2017 celebration of their 25th Anniversary. Ms. Wheatcraft distributed the AAHA's activities itinerary.
- Virginia Department of Transportation is in the process of reevaluating the state historic bridge inventory. Staff has received a letter notification from VDOT requesting input from Fauquier County.

6. The next meeting is scheduled for Wednesday, February 1, 2017
7. There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 6:00 p.m.